

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION
DRAFT MINUTES OF MEETING
FRIDAY, JANUARY 21, 2005
KAISER CENTER BUILDING ROOM 512**

I. Chair’s Announcements

- Arvan Fluharty, UCOPE Chair

Chair Fluharty welcomed new and returning UCOPE members and consultants. After committee members introduced themselves, Chair Fluharty reviewed the committee’s charge under Senate Bylaw 192 and provided an overview of committee operations.

II. Consent Calendar

- Minutes of the April 19, 2004 UCOPE minutes

ACTION: UCOPE unanimously approved the minutes of the April 19, 2004 UCOPE meeting with four amendments.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Student Academic Services

- Jeanne Hargrove, Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) & High School Articulation Coordinator
- Susan Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

REPORT: Jeanne Hargrove provided the committee with a report on the following items:

- A. 2004 AWPE Exam: In 2004, there were 16,000 AWPE test takers, down 14 percent from 18,000 in 2003 perhaps because admissions were down 10 percent at UC, or UC is admitting stronger students. Of the 16,000 test takers, 51 percent passed, up from 48 percent last year. There was an increase in fee waivers granted, including 17 percent of test takers, which is up from 16 percent in 2003.
- B. Selection of New AWPE Vendor: The request for proposals (RFP) was distributed in June 2004 for the new AWPE vendor, and two bids were received in July from ETS, the current AWPE vendor, and Pearson Government Solutions. Subsequently, a UCOP committee was formed to review bids in two phases: (1) with scoring rubric, the committee voted without considering vendor fees; Pearson came out ahead in its answering of RFP questions, especially regarding its future plans for the AWPE; (2) the committee evaluated the vendor fees separately, provided over a three-year period with the opportunity for renewal. Pearson was again the victor. Subsequently, cost negotiations ensued with Pearson, and Pearson was awarded the AWPE contract. Pearson is a well-known company, and owns FAFSA, controls most education publishing, and also does contract work for UCOP.
- C. 2005 AWPE Exam: The AWPE will be offered May 14, 2005, though it is possible that the exam could be offered two weeks earlier. The reading and scoring of the AWPE will take place at the Clark-Kerr campus in Berkeley. Test takers will be notified of the exam by email this year, with a follow-up mailing if they do not

respond. Also this year, students have the option to pay for the AWPE by credit card. The AWPE will continue to be hand-written and hand-scored for now, a decision made after Pearson commissioned a study on electronic versions of the AWPE and found no cost savings.

DISCUSSION: Some UCOPE members questioned this decision in light of the fact that most students, they felt, no longer write exams or papers by hand and most exclusively write on the computer. Fearing a handwritten exam places these students at a disadvantage, some UCOPE members would prefer there be an option for students to write the exam on a computer. Other members pointed out that the AWPE is a placement exam and a measure of a student's ability to function effectively in courses at UC, which mainly offer handwritten exams. Another member commented that there is a fairness issue here regarding differential access to computers and that it is still not students' universal preference to use computers. Most agreed that computers should be made available however, to those students who prefer not to handwrite the AWPE.

D. Standard Level (SL) International Baccalaureate (IB) Standards: Jeanne Hargrove reported that she is experiencing difficulty in retrieving information from the IB programs, in order to determine whether SL IB courses satisfy the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement (UC-ELWR). Jeanne Hargrove also requested volunteers to read SL IB course exams to determine whether they are equivalent to the AWPE. High level IB course exams currently satisfy the UC-ELWR at level 5. Chair Fluharty explained the disconnect here, given that BOARS has determined SL IB courses as college level therefore the student may enroll in the subsequent writing course at the university; yet UCOPE currently does not allow the SL IB course to satisfy the UC-ELWR and therefore students' passage into the subsequent writing course is prevented. Chair Fluharty said that UCOPE requires additional time and information to make a decision on this issue.

ACTION: The following UCOPE members volunteered to read the SL IB exams: Vice Chair Roz Spafford, and Deborah Willis who will also solicit additional volunteers from UCR.

ACTION: Jeanne Hargrove will report to UCOPE when she receives more information from the IB programs, and UCOPE will then decide whether SL IB courses satisfy the UC-ELWR.

ACTION: Jeanne Hargrove will distribute an electronic version of the ETS Annual Report to UCOPE members following the meeting.

REPORT: Susan Wilbur provided the committee with a report on the following items:

A. Changes in Admissions Testing Requirements – The New SAT and ACT Writing Component: Students applying to UC in fall 2005, entering UC in fall 2006, will be required to take the new SAT or the new ACT, plus two SATII subject exams. A SAT score of 680 on the old SATII writing exam had satisfied the UC-ELWR.

ISSUE: There are two issues (1): what score UCOPE will allow on the new SAT writing exam to satisfy the UC-ELWR; and (2) UCOPE must decide what ACT writing score will satisfy the UC-ELWR (no scores or history of this exam currently exist).

1. New SAT Exam: The SAT will consist of a critical reading component, mathematics, and a writing component. The College Board and ETS evaluated the new SAT and the old SAT II writing exam, and students' performance had a correlation of 85 percent.

2. New ACT Exam: The ACT will now have a writing component. Susan Wilbur said that data for the new ACT will also be available in October 2005, and that data analysis will be prepared in time for UCOPE's January 2006 meeting.

DISCUSSION: UCOPE members discussed the implications of the 85 percent correlation. One member suggested that UCOPE wait until the new SAT has been administered at least two times before UCOPE assigns a passing score. Another member inquired about the practical differences in the old SATII versus the new SAT. One member said that the new SAT is much like the current AWPE, and the old SATII allowed students 20 minutes to write the exam and the new SAT allows 25 minutes. Susan Wilbur explained that the new SAT is administered in March, May, June and October 2005, and that the College Board would like to wait until after the October administration to make the scoring decision. UCOPE members agreed to wait until the committee's January 2006 meeting, when test score data will be completed and available to the committee, to set the new SAT score for satisfaction of the UC-ELWR. Susan Wilbur assured the committee that this timeline allows for the entering class of fall 2006 to receive credit for satisfying the UC-ELWR under the new SAT scoring rubric. One member noted that an 85 percent correlation between old and new SAT scores is phenomenal and if accurate, that UCOPE could approve the current 680 score, with the option to adjust it after October 2005.

DISCUSSION: Regarding the issue of assessing writing proficiency, one member suggested that UCOPE has the opportunity to establish criterion for determining writing proficiency; and that since the AWPE is successful in assessing writing proficiency, why not require the AWPE for all students and abandon the SAT requirement. Another member reminded the committee that UC wants to encourage students to take challenging courses in high school, such as AP and IB courses, which also offer students the ability to bypass the AWPE. One member said that the AWPE is not a proficiency exam, but a placement exam.

ACTION: At its January 2006 meeting, UCOPE will set the passing scores for satisfaction of the UC Entry-Level Writing Requirement under the new SAT and ACT exams, at which time corresponding data analyses from the 2005 administrations of the AWPE, and the new SAT and ACT exams will be made available.

- B. CSU Early Assessment Program: Susan Wilbur informed the committee about CSU's Early Assessment Program for English and math skills, developed due to its problems with remediation. The CSU program has three components. The first component is an 11th grade math and English assessment under an augmented state standards exam, with added questions based on performance. Students are either determined to have satisfied the CSU entry-level requirement, or they are redirected to a different 12th grade course to address remediation, the second component. The first test was administered in spring 2004 to student volunteers, and a website is available to view the results. The third component is a professional development program. UC is implicated in CSU's effort because UC does not appear as good in the public eye compared to CSU on this issue. The program has received great praise from many, including Jack O'Connell, State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

ACTION: UCOPE will discuss the CSU Early Assessment Program at a future meeting.

IV. UCOPE ESL Subcommittee – Update

- Jan Frodesen, ESL Subcommittee Chair

REPORT: Subcommittee Chair Frodesen noted that the ESL Subcommittee is planning to meet in March 2005, and then distributed a report prepared for UCOPE’s information. She reviewed with the committee the placement of E-designated students into ESL courses: graders can give a score of “no pass” to an AWPE, and then has the choice to give the exam a “non-native-like rhetoric” designation and an “e-score.” E-designated exams are then re-read on the campuses where a student may be placed in an ESL course (if the campus offers one), or a standard writing course. At UCR, there are not enough ESL courses available to accommodate the overflow of E-designated students. UCSC does not offer ESL courses, but does offer an “ESL support course” for grammar and editing. Due to time constraints, Subcommittee Chair Frodesen directed the committee to review the contents of her written report.

DISCUSSION: Members noted numerous issues implicated in placement of students in ESL courses, including how to place students who have language problems but who do not belong in an ESL course – for example “generation 1.5” students (those who know English well, but whose language errors have been “fossilized” over many years, compared to typical ESL learners who are still in the process of learning the English language). One member questioned whether the appropriate ESL courses are being offered at UC, which address the diverse language and writing needs of the ESL population. Members then informed the committee regarding ESL course offerings at their respective campuses. At UCSB, courses for generation 1.5 students are different from the standard ESL course, and are based on information from students’ AWPE and SAT verbal scores. At UCLA, a second, more substantial writing course is now offered for ESL writing and is taught by an ESL writing specialist. One member mentioned the stigma that accompanies a student’s ESL designation, also a topic of interest at IMPAC and CCC. Vice Chair Spafford said that at UCSC, access to grammar classes is problematic, and often students who could not enroll in the grammar course their first quarter fall behind those who could enroll.

ACTION: Subcommittee Chair Frodesen will report to UCOPE in April regarding the subcommittee’s March meeting.

V. Analytical Writing Placement Exam – Review and Selection of Essay Prompts

- George Gadda, UCLA Writing Program

ISSUE: The AWPE Subcommittee forwarded six writing exercises for the committee to consider and select among for the administration of the May 2005 AWPE. The development and pre-testing phases had already occurred within the AWPE Subcommittee, who then generated writing exercises that are varied and match well with past exam performances.

DISCUSSION: The committee discussed the six writing exercises and voted according to preference. Due to the confidential nature of this discussion, notes were not taken.

ACTION: UCOPE members selected the writing exercise that will be offered in the May 2005 administration of the AWPE.

UCOPE Executive Session

VI. Committee Business

- Confirmation of UCOPE Subcommittee appointments.

ACTION: UCOPE members unanimously confirmed the appointees to the AWPE and ESL Subcommittees.

VII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- George Blumenthal, Academic Council Chair
- Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Academic Senate Executive Director

REPORT: Chair Blumenthal discussed the notion of shared governance within the university and the Academic Senate, the liaison role of committee members between the systemwide and local Senate committees, and the roles of student representatives and the committee analyst. Chair Blumenthal also informed the committee of Senate issues and goals for the 2004-05 academic year, including: long-range planning for the university; the current state of the UC budget and undergraduate admissions; legislative and ballot proposals which would affect the UC Retirement System; the UC advocacy effort and the Senate's involvement in tracking and analyzing state legislation; updates on UC Merced and the university laboratories; and updates on current proposals and issues under systemwide Senate review.

REPORT: Executive Director Bertero-Barcelo provided the committee with a report on the Academic Senate website and website policy, office resource issues, the *Senate Source* newsletter, and Senate travel policies and procedures.

VIII. UCEP Proposal: Possible Systemwide Entry-Level Mathematics or Quantitative Research Skills and Methods Entrance Requirement

- Teleconference with Richard Hughey, UCEP member

ISSUE: In December 2004, the University Committee on Education Policy proposed a plan to collaborate with UCOPE regarding the possible development of a Systemwide Entry-Level Mathematics or Quantitative Research Skills and Methods Entrance Requirement, analogous to the UC Entry-Level Writing Requirement.

DISCUSSION: UCEP Member Hughey provided an overview of UCEP's plan, especially regarding general math requirements at UC, how the AWPE has been good for the university in developing general writing proficiency among students, and that such a "math requirement" could act as an incentive to emphasize math training at the high school level. UCEP Member Hughey is aware of a study submitted last year by UCOPE, and would like it to serve as a starting point for this proposal.

ACTION: UCOPE members John Eggers and Ali Sayed, and UCEP member Richard Hughey will form a joint UCOPE/UCEP Subcommittee to study the possible Systemwide Entry-Level Mathematics or Quantitative Research Skills and Methods Entrance Requirement, and will report to their respective committees with any findings and updates.

IX. Class Size for Writing Classes at UC

- Susan Jarratt
- Susan McLeod

ISSUE: In May 2004, UCOPE submitted to Council a proposal that the class size for all UC Entry Level Writing Requirement (UC-ELWR) classes and classes designed to enable students to complete the UC-ELWR be ideally capped at fifteen students. At its July 2004 meeting, Council

concluded that before it could make a decision on the UCOPE proposal, UCOPE would need to submit data on the effectiveness of writing instruction vis-à-vis class size. UCOPE must now decide how to develop and collect such data.

DISCUSSION: Member Jarratt opened the discussion by declaring that systemwide, UC is out of step with its comparison institutions regarding class size, especially in writing classes, as depicted in her comparison chart (Agenda Enclosure 9(c)). Committee members then brainstormed methods to collect the data requested by Council, and Member McLeod explained that such a study on the “effectiveness” of instruction vis-à-vis class size would be practically impossible. Member McLeod explained that the data does not exist from the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) study and recommendations, but that there is a study available from the early 1900’s. She suggested that the committee submits to Council a “best practices” report related to class size recommendations. Member Jarratt commented that the NCTE guidelines place great importance on total teaching workload, where teachers should have no more than 60 students per term – and 25 students per class is acceptable only if the teacher does not have more than 60 students per term. Vice Chair Spafford raised the issue of funding problems related to increased class sizes. Committee members agreed that the UCOPE report should include the pedagogy for basic writing classes. Member Jarratt mentioned that she has data on the success rate of entry-level students and their success rate in latter courses, and said that it would be useful to obtain similar data from the other campuses.

ACTION: UCOPE members Susan McLeod, Susan Jarratt and Deborah Willis will continue to work on obtaining workable data on the effectiveness of writing instruction vis-à-vis class size, describing the pedagogy for writing classes, and concentrating on teaching workload issues and the impact on students’ success in latter courses. They will also provide a progress report at a future UCOPE meeting.

X. UCOPE Member Items

- Deborah Willis

REPORT: Deborah Willis reported to the committee on budget allocation problems at UCR and the related impact on students’ opportunities to satisfy the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement (UC-ELWR). UCR’s UC-ELWR course offering system is currently in flux, and is undergoing changes related to possible outsourcing to a local community college, assessing extra student fees for the required courses, and shortening the time allowed to fulfill the UC-ELWR at the UC Riverside campus. The UCR divisional Senate has formed a task force to develop short and long-term solutions.

DISCUSSION: Deborah Willis questioned the committee about members’ experiences related to these issues at their campuses. Members shared varying experiences due to the great diversity in approaches taken by the nine UC campuses regarding their UC-ELWR courses, and it became apparent that the problems at UCR deserve particular attention. Members then discussed options available for UCOPE to support UC-ELWR courses at UCR without assessing extra student fees.

ACTION: Deborah Willis will continue to monitor the UC-ELWR issue at her campus and report to UCOPE on new developments.

ACTION: UCOPE will continue its discussion of budget allocation problems and students satisfying the UC-ELWR at a future UCOPE meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00pm

Attest: Arvan Fluharty, UCOPE Chair

Prepared by: Michelle Ruskofsky, Committee Analyst